

# Hon. Solon Low: ABERHART:

"... If I were in the PREMIER'S place today, I would STOP Zubick from publishing another issue of that paper if it was MY LAST MORTAL ACT, and I am advising the Premier TO DO JUST THAT."

"... Foolish Declarations, ENTIRELY FALSE... I do not see what the PURPOSE could be in putting in jail such a man as this editor appears to be.—What IS Mr. Low's PURPOSE in advising Aberhart to "do just that"?"

# THE REBEL

Vol. 2. No. 2.

CALGARY, ALTA., JANUARY 2, 1939

10 Cents.

## ABERHART MUST FIGHT OR QUIT!

Col. Drew's Charges Regarding Bren Gun Contract Bring Immediate Public Investigation — In Alberta, Where FAR MORE SERIOUS Charges Are Made Against Premier of Province by Former Cabinet Ministers, Public Leaders, Private Individuals, and Publications, Aberhart Dismisses Allegations With Pious Exclamation: "What if all These Charges ARE TRUE? Mistakes Under The Direction of God Are NOT MISTAKES, but STEPPING-STONES TO SUCCESS!"

## PUBLIC LEADERS "ON THE SPOT"!

GOOD GOVERNMENT IMPOSSIBLE UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES—THE REBEL DEMANDS  
**Justice For Aberhart**

Yes, we demand justice for Premier Aberhart! Yes, these public men who have been criticising our Premier so severely, are going to be "put on the spot." We are in full support of those. Social Crediters who are demanding so loudly that "something must be done" to stop this terrible vilification and abuse of Premier Aberhart.

No, we are not trying to be funny or sarcastic. We mean every word we say. We demand justice for Premier Aberhart—whether he wants it or not.

We have ALWAYS contended that it is a terrible state of affairs that the premier of our province should be publicly charged with such serious public misconduct as has been alleged against Mr. Aberhart and that he should be constantly held up to public ridicule and contempt, without anything being done about it. We feel sure that such a state of affairs would not be tolerated for long anywhere but in Alberta, where for three years we have been the laughing-stock of the world, and by our indifference to public immorality are collectively meriting ever more justly the charge of outsiders that we are a bunch of "nuts," without any sense of proportion, easy marks for the wiles of every racketeer that comes along,—mind-readers, astrologers, fortune-tellers, rain-makers, and, particularly, religious shysters. We suggest it as high time to call a halt to this tragedy, for such it is coming to be.

Let us first deal with those Social Crediters who are so vociferous in their demands that something should be done to stop US from attacking our Premier. We are in absolute agreement with

(Continued on Page 2)

**Why Does Low Urge Premier to Take Action? Why Does Aberhart Refuse?**

DO LETTERS FROM PREMIER ABERHART AND HON. SOLON LOW GIVE ANSWER?



(The letters quoted below, being signed by their authors in their official capacities of Provincial Treasurer and Premier, respectively, are PUBLIC documents, dealing with PUBLIC business, and we are therefore at perfect liberty to deal with them publicly. We ask the public to study them with care, to ponder seriously over the conflicting reasons given for not taking action against us, and, particularly, over the Hon. Solon Low's declaration as to what HE would do to us if HE were PREMIER. There is no extra charge for our occasional interjections. Bold face and capitalized words are ours.)

**LETTER FROM HON. SOLON LOW**

Edmonton, Dec. 14th, 1938.

"Dear Mr. (Name withheld): Your letter of December 13th received and herewith acknowledged, together with the copy of a recent number of 'The Rebel'.

"I have spoken to the Premier on a number of occasions about the serious charges made by this man Zubick, but he seems reluctant to take action against him for a number of reasons, chief among which are:

"1. Zubick evidently wants just that. He appears anxious to goad Mr. Aberhart into laying charges in the courts so that the usual newspaper display of evidence might be screamed across the country. He, Zubick, knows full well what construction would be put upon ANY EVIDENCE, BY THE NEWSPAPERS, most of whom are enemies of the Premier, and he is willing to chance even a penitentiary term to get the satisfaction of having his own contemptible statements before a Judge held up to review and endless repetition before the people of the world.

(Continued on Page 8)

**JUSTICE FOR ABERHART**—Continued from Page 1.

them that, if the charges which we have made against Mr. Aberhart are false; as these good people claim, and necessarily **MUST** claim if they believe in Mr. Aberhart's innocence, then all the force of the law should be visited upon our head; only, we contend, too, and with justice, we submit, that if our charges are **TRUE**, Mr. Aberhart has no right to retain office, and that if such is the case, the "something" that should be done is that appropriate action be taken against HIM. The joker here is that these good people want a one-sided justice. They want us punished and Aberhart protected, without regard as to who may be guilty or innocent. Then, the double joker is that we "beat them to the punch" long ago, for the truth is that **WE WERE THE FIRST** to demand of Mr. Aberhart to take action against us if he thought us wrong, as he **MUST**, if he thinks himself right. So, finding themselves in this supremely ridiculous position, all they can do is to gnash their teeth in impotent rage and rave hysterically about "something" having to be done.

We ask them: Who is stopping you? We are with you 100 percent in demanding that something be done. Why don't you **DO** something? Do you expect us to arrest ourselves, try ourselves, find ourselves guilty, and send ourselves to jail? If you honestly believe us to be the awful criminal you say we are, why don't you go to your Premier, who, as attorney general, is **UNDER OATH** to enforce the law, to **PUNISH** criminals, and demand of him that he **DO HIS DUTY**? We don't want to discourage you, but we do not think you will get much help from your Premier, for you know, of course, that he undoubtedly would have stopped us long ago if he could have done so without having to come into the open. As we have stated publicly before, immediately after the very first issue of the first series of *The Rebel* came off the press, nearly two years ago, Mr. Aberhart approached two prominent Calgary lawyers about ways and means of stopping us; and when he got no satisfaction there, he even tried to get his then attorney general, Mr. Hugill, to institute proceedings against us. But, when he discovered that he would, of course, have to appear in court himself, his ardor for justice evaporated, and instead of doing his duty toward us, and himself, he entered his political pulpit and offered prayers about blessing "them that persecute you." What rank hypocrisy!

We have left nothing undone to give Mr. Aberhart **EVERY ADVANTAGE**. We have offered to apologize and recant if he would only be so good as to correct us, or to go into court if necessary. But he has refused to either correct us or to take court action. Honestly, now, how could we possibly be more fair?

But, let us go still farther. In deference to those who hold the foolish delusion that we are a **MEAN** nobody and should therefore be ignored by the great and glorious Aberhart, let us grant that perhaps we are but an ignorant nincompoop, unworthy of the slightest attention. What then? Is the situation at all improved? Has no one else made charges against Mr. Aberhart of at least equal seriousness to those which we have made? Let us see.

J. W. Hugill, K.C., M.L.A., Mr. Aberhart's former attorney general, charged, publicly, that he had been dismissed from office by Mr. Aberhart because he had protested against the government's **ILLEGAL** legislation. Could a more serious charge be made against the Premier than that he **WILFULLY CHOSE TO BREAK THE LAW**? We defy **ANYONE** to show where we have ever made a more serious charge.

Chas. Cockroft, M.L.A., former cabinet minister under Mr. Aberhart, charged publicly that Mr. Aberhart had at one time conspired in a design to misappropriate public funds. A similar charge was made by D. M. Duggan, M.L.A., a few weeks ago, over radio station CFKN, when he described Mr. Aberhart's depletion of the provincial sinking fund as tantamount to the act of an employee taking money from his master's till and leaving worthless I.O.U.'s in its place. Now, should these serious charges, by these **RESPONSIBLE** public men, be regarded as harmless jokes, or be taken seriously? Again, we defy anyone to show where we have ever made a more serious charge.

A. E. Fee, Social Credit M.L.A., now supporting Mr. Aberhart, charged publicly that Premier Aberhart had personally caused to be circulated a petition **DEMANDING HIS OWN RESIGNATION**. We did not make this charge. Mr. Fee, a personal supporter of Mr. Aberhart, made it. Would you say that any person capable of such cowardice and duplicity as Mr. Fee charged against Mr. Aberhart could possibly be fit to hold the high office of Premier?

Then, don't forget that a large number of Social Credit members of the legislature, at the time of the insurgency, made a long list of charges against Mr. Aberhart. They accused him **PUBLICLY** of being a liar, double-crosser and in general just about the worst kind of scoundrel, and their accusations most certainly warranted public investigation. But nothing was done. Jos. Shaw, K.C.; William Irvine, ex-M.P.; J. J. Bowden, M.L.A., and many others in high positions of responsibility have made charges against Premier Aberhart which, if true, would be more than sufficient cause for his removal from office. Yet Mr. Aberhart will not even answer these gentlemen.

So we could go on ad nauseum in this strain with scores of examples, but we give only one more. Only last June, in his report to the Governor General regarding certain Alberta legislation, Prime Minister Mackenzie King said: "**The Alberta legislature has not, in the minister's opinion (the Minister of Justice) and in that of the government, engaged itself**

**GENUINELY AND IN GOOD FAITH** in the legislative field assigned to it by the B.N.A. Act. Instead, it has **DELIBERATELY** legislated in a manner **INJURIOUS** TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST OF Canada and contrary to the clear intention of the Act of Confederation." Was there ever stronger language in an official document in more complete condemnation of the **DELIBERATE DISHONESTY** of a Premier and his government? Have WE ever made a more serious allegation against our Premier?

When Col. Drew made certain charges in connection with the Bren gun contracts, did Prime Minister King wail and weep about "diabolical misrepresentation"? No; instead, like any honorable head of any honest government would do, he immediately ordered a public investigation. But in Alberta, where charges far more serious than mere irregularities in a contract are openly preferred against the head of the government, by persons in the highest positions of responsibility, **OUR** Premier disposes of the charges in what manner? Does he face his accusers like a man? Well, you will recall how this "brave, honorable, Christian gentleman" disposed of them at the time of the insurgency. Here are his words: "Like Nelson, I will hold the telescope to my blind eye. I will not see these unpleasant things . . . What if all these charges ARE TRUE? . . . Mistakes under the direction of God are NOT MISTAKES, but **STEPPING-STONES TO SUCCESS**." We have not the words to express our contempt for such blasphemous hypocrisy. What do YOU think? Was that a proper, honest, honorable, courageous manner of answering serious charges of public misconduct? Is this to be our new standard of justice?

We submit to you that it is an impossible situation. Government being what it is—the regulation of human relationships in all their manifold complexities of desires, fears, hopes, prejudices, hates, loves and passions, surely even those most anxious for the successful culmination of their ideals, political, moral, spiritual or economic, must realize that good government is utterly **IMPOSSIBLE** under circumstances where the people are divided into warring camps, where suspicion, strife and hatred are rampant and where **AUTHORITY PLACES ITSELF ABOVE THE LAW**. It is precisely because we recognized the absurdity of the situation at the very beginning that we went on record then—not against Social Credit, because the theory of Social Credit has never been presented for discussion upon its merits in Alberta, but we went on record then that there could be no Social Credit or good government of any kind until the atmosphere were cleared of the vilification and slander which has been the chief characteristic of the Alberta political scene since Mr. Aberhart entered public life. YOU know in your heart that Mr. Aberhart himself is personally responsible for having introduced this element into the political atmosphere of our province. It is he who started the ball rolling by calling his opponents rats, liars, Sons of Satan, reprobates, fornicators, useless asses, howling wolves, barking dogs. Today he is reaping the harvest of what he has sown. The only difference is that while Aberhart was too yellow to name his opponents when he vilified and slandered them so shamefully, his critics today tell him to his face what they think of him; and, being still as yellow as ever, he dares not answer.

Being too cowardly to face his accusers, should he then be left to keep on posing as a martyr? Is **JUSTICE TO BE DECIDED BY THE WHIMS AND WISHES OF THE ACCUSED**? Surely, if he were innocent, Aberhart should be the first to defend the dignity of his high office of Premier, and, as attorney general, he should be especially zealous in punishing evil-doers. That is his special duty. But, as he refuses to do either, surely it is the clear duty of every citizen, be he for or against the government, to demand that justice be done. We submit it as the special duty of the members of the legislature, both government and opposition, particularly of those who have been throwing their hands up in holy horror over what we have had to say in *The Rebel*, to demand that action be taken in respect of all the serious charges that have been made against Mr. Aberhart, not only by us, but also by many of them and others in positions of responsibility, not forgetting the most serious charge by Prime Minister King. These elected representatives of the people **HAVE NO RIGHT** to allow Mr. Aberhart to forever evade his duty of facing these charges. We expect nothing but **EVASION FROM MR. ABERHART; but we expect these other public servants TO DO THEIR DUTY**. By their own failure to perform their clear duty of making Aberhart face the music, they have encouraged him in his conceit and duplicity and have needlessly prolonged the prevalent discord and strife. They know that Aberhart is the **CAUSE** of this discord and strife. They know that until he is removed from office there can be no end to this terrible state of affairs, and therefore no rational approach to the economic problems confronting us. Therefore, we demand that they do their duty.

"**POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS**."—Aberhart, Calgary, Dec. 11: "I have never had any political aspirations and have not now."—If that is true, he has no business being the leader of a political party and head of a government. Every citizen worthy of the name **SHOULD HAVE** "political aspirations"—aspirations to serve the best temporal interests of his country. Any aspirations in this direction must by their very nature be "political," and any person taking an active part in the affairs of state who claims that he has no political aspirations proves by his claim that he either does not understand the meaning and purpose of politics, or that he is a political swindler.



# Who Runs the Alberta Government?

Extracts from radio addresses by the editor of The Rebel on the Alberta oil situation.

## "WHO RUNS ALBERTA?"

Nov. 28—Has the Aberhart government, which poses as the relentless enemy of the Fifty Big Shots and Financial Octopuses in general, and as the divinely-inspired, heaven-directed champion of the underdog in particular, "sold out" the very people which it professes so piously to protect, and surrendered to and allied itself with the very financial interests which it claims so vociferously to combat? The legislation in regard to gas conservation enacted at the recent special session of the legislature indicates that the government has done just that.

This special session of the legislature was called for the specific purpose of giving the gas conservation board, under the direction of Knode of Texas, unlimited power to enforce its regulations. You know why. Certain independent oil producers, claiming that by the previous regulations the government was discriminating against them to the benefit of the Imperial Oil and major oil interests in general, openly defied the law. This was a serious situation and called for action. Remember, it was the independents, the small fellows, who were protesting, while the big fellows were content with the regulations. . . . Well, action came promptly. The legislature was called into special session. But, was it called because of the government's heartfelt concern, as one might expect, over the injustices claimed by the independents, or was the House called into special session to strengthen the grip of the big companies who have been gradually squeezing the independents out of business?

You know what happened. A law was passed in which the conservation board was endowed with powers which, as William Irvine said in the People's Weekly, only the Almighty is fit to wield. Under the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which means the cabinet, the board was given complete dictatorial powers. It can make any order and give it effect. Heavy penalties are provided for non-compliance, and, incredible as it may seem, apart from claims in regard to assessments, no order of the board is subject to attack or review in the courts. That is naked, unashamed Fascism. . . . I felt sure a week ago that government members would never allow the bill to become law. But apparently I overestimated their intelligence as well as their political sagacity.

This law is now on our statute books as still another positive proof of the Aberhart government's long obvious design to destroy the foundations of freedom and justice, and by the same token, another challenge to all who would preserve liberty, to arise and make an end of this shameful usurpation and abuse of power. . . . I don't blame the big companies for looking after their own interests. That is their business. But I do object to surrendering the oil industry to the tender mercies of the interests who are even now importing millions of barrels of oil into the country; and this legislation means just that.

It is significant to observe, too, that immediately after the special session in which the financial interests were virtually made a gift of the oil industry, Premier Aberhart and Treasurer Low departed for the East to dicker with the allegedly despised Money Barons in regard to refunding the provincial debt. Whence cometh this sudden love for the hated Fifty Big Shots?

## THE COURTS MUST BE FREE

However, my chief concern, and yours I hope, is over the vicious principle embodied in this law which denies complainants access to the courts. If I may use an Aberhart expression, I would say the principle is "diabolical." In a British country, even a murderer is not condemned without fair trial; and if we condone this theft of the right to justice where others are concerned, we have killed democracy and are inviting Dictator Aberhart to deny us the same privilege whenever it should please his fancy to impose his political will upon us. The courts must be open to all citizens, and he who approves a government which would deny that privilege to ANYONE, is not fit for citizenship in a free country. It is axiomatic in our conception of democracy that the legislative and the judicial functions must be separate. The moment the legislature assumes the judicial function, the courts are the victim of a political party, and in that moment democracy ends and political tyranny begins. The courts must be a thing apart. They must serve both as an unfettered refuge of justice for the citizen and as a restraint against the abuse of power by governments. By this legislation, the government has deliberately set at naught this fundamental safeguard of democracy. At the same time, it has given virtual control of the oil industry into the hands of interests which, instead of developing it to maximum capacity, and the benefit of the people, are stifling it by enforcing proration and so-called conservation while at the same time they are importing millions of barrels of oil into the country. We may well ask ourselves, "Who is running Alberta?"

## BROADCAST DECEMBER 5

After reading two editorials from The Albertan to show that Canada imports ninety percent of her oil requirements, through the very interests which dictate proration in Turner Valley, we said in part:

Yet, in spite of having full knowledge of the deplorable state of affairs, our government has been making a great hullabaloo over the encouragement and stimulus it professes to have given oil development. Within one month after proration was enforced by the Imperial Oil and B.A. Oil, the value of oil stocks on the Calgary exchange dropped over fifty million dollars. Does that sound like encouragement of the oil industry and public confidence in the government's policy? Let me give you another striking illustration. I know of one independent company owning two wells, with its shares held, of course, by the public. It cost \$305,000 to drill these wells. They have produced over \$200,000 worth of oil, and in addition, the company has drilling equipment and other physical assets valued at \$140,000. Yet, at the market price of the stock since proration was instituted by the major companies, both of these wells, including the \$140,000 in equipment, could be bought out completely for \$105,000—for \$35,000 less than the value of the equipment alone. Does that make sense? Why this crazy situation? Simply because the arbitrary enforcement of proration and price-fixing by the big interests has perverted the public mind as to the real values of stocks and has destroyed confidence. In the meantime, the independents are being forced toward surrender to the major companies, and by its legislation, which plays directly into their hands, the government is hastening the ruin of the independents and strengthening the stranglehold of the big corporations. This legislation, with its denial of justice in the courts, its unfairness to the independents and favoring of the big companies, coupled with the secret debt refunding scheme, has all the earmarks of a plot similar to the Newfoundland sell-out of natural resources to financial interests not so many years ago. The people should be on their guard. . . . Particularly should we be suspicious of the Aberhart government, which behaves like some silly secret society, and while preaching piety practices iniquity.

## DECEMBER 12 BROADCAST

In reply to the suggestion that as the oil interests were chiefly concerned with this legislation and that they appeared satisfied with it we should not be so critical of the clause barring complainants from the courts, we said in part:

It is true that the major oil companies did not oppose it. But not all of the independents have as yet submitted to the degradation of approving the government's theft of the right to free access to the courts. The fact that the big companies are not opposed to the legislation is not a good reason for approving it, but rather the very best of reasons for scrutinizing it the more closely. My criticism is not of the major oil companies as such, nor am I defending the independents as such. . . . My objection is to the government's iniquitous legislation by which it has virtually "sold out" the oil industry into the monopolistic control of the major companies which are now retarding development. . . . while at the same time they are importing millions of barrels of oil. Above all, I object to the vicious principle of barring citizens from the courts. These are matters of vital concern to the public as a whole. In regard to the courts, there simply are no two sides to the matter. To deny any citizen, be it with or without his consent, the right to fair trial in a court of law, under any circumstances, at any time, cannot be justified upon any grounds whatsoever, not even if it be done by a government with the full consent of all the people themselves. It is by its very nature a crime no less reprehensible than may have been committed by those denied this right, and any government which would seek such tyrannical power over any citizen, automatically condemns itself as morally unfit to govern. Likewise, any citizen, particularly he who is always prating piously about doing unto others as you would have others do unto you, who yet approves a government which wilfully violates this elementary principle of justice, such a person is a rank hypocrite. However, I do not purpose to argue the matter further; for any honorable, honest person is already by virtue of his honesty and sense of justice, convinced that DENIAL of justice is CRIMINAL, while those who think otherwise are by virtue of their position either so ignorant or dishonest that a logical argument could not possibly make an impression upon their perverted minds anyway.

**MRS. GOSTICK DOING WELL**—Yes, Mrs. Gostick is doing well as a faithful follower of Bro. Aberhart. For some time now she has been drawing \$8 per day as a member of a committee supposedly investigating the relief situation. We are informed that she was also drawing the same amount per day while she was supposed to be doing "welfare" work in distributing fruit, etc., for the government last year. All this in addition to her \$2,000 per year sessional indemnity. The forthcoming convention of S.C. women's auxiliaries could do worse than to ask Mrs. Gostick a few pointed questions on how much she and members of her family have drawn in government money since she slipped into office under the Aberhartian fraud.

# THE REBEL

"INDEPENDENT ALWAYS—NEUTRAL NEVER"

Published by J. J. Zubick, 426 - 15th Street N.W., Calgary, Alta.

Calgary, Alberta, Canada

January 2, 1939

## REBELETES

**FOOLING NOBODY!**—Bro. Aberhart has been going in strong for dramatics of late in his Sunday "Happy Hour" programs, and it is particularly pathetic to note the obvious attempts now and then to give the impression that the dialogues are spontaneous and not pre-arranged. For instance, in the Dec. 11 broadcast from Calgary, Mr. Aberhart was chattering merrily away about the wonders of having a "cheeful spirit," when, at a psychological moment, a female voice chirped up with an appropriate Scriptural quotation. As though surprised, Aberhart exclaimed, "Who said that?" The female voice, sweetly: "I did, Sir!" Bro. Aberhart: "What is your name?" etc.—All as though the girl had not been primed and "all set" to break in with her little piece at the right time! This sort of play-acting, with its obvious deception, is a cheap mockery of religion.

**OK, KELLOWAY!**—While we have found much to criticize in the methods employed by the Rev. Dr. Kelloway in furthering his political ideas, this does not mean that we have always disagreed with what he has said. For instance, when he said in the course of a recent radio talk that there never would be true democracy until the people were willing and able to take full responsibility, we are in full agreement with him. The assumption and EXERCISE of the responsibilities of citizenship as being VITAL to the right functioning of democracy has been one of the high notes in our theme song these many years. Dictatorships are live and pulsating things today because under them citizens are COMPELLED to assume and discharge obligations which in a democracy they are presumed to have the gumption to assume and discharge VOLUNTARILY. Where citizens fail in this duty, there democracy automatically ceases to function and dictatorship automatically begins. Dictatorship is IMPOSSIBLE where citizens do their duty; but it is inevitable where they do not do their duty.

**SURE, BLAME CUSACK!**—Polling booth in recent Calgary civic elections. Frank Cusack, as returning officer, behind ballot boxes. Outside, two Socreds; one of them pointing finger at Cusack's back in front of window. "See, there he is, that dirty son of a . . . Zubick, hired by the C.G.T.A. to stuff the ballot boxes! Something should be done about it!"—Poor Frank, forever getting the blame for our alleged crimes, and we forever getting the credit for his virtues! Some day, when we are Premier, or something, we shall reward Frank for having suffered persecution in our behalf. But, be that as it may, instead of being such a harmless-looking cuss, we only had Frank's Irish map, red hair and fog-horn voice to work in with our "Irish" temperament, we could have twice as much fun as we have now with these nit-wit Aberhart nuts in half the time.

**BARGAIN SALE!**—Did you know that the "Case for Alberta," the brief which the Alberta government refused to present before the Rowell Royal Commission, and which was gotten up in book form, with "loud" cover design like some fiction best-seller (it is largely fiction, at that), is now being sold in retail book stores at \$1.25 per copy? And did you know that for this book, which must have cost around \$5 per copy to print, the government is getting the magnificent sum of 85 cents? "Results, not methods,"—Oh, yeah!

**CORRESPONDENCE NEXT ISSUE.**—Owing to an over-abundance of material for this issue, we are unable to include any of the vast amount of correspondence from all over Canada. We intend to publish extracts from much of this in our next issue. In the meantime, write in, letting us have your opinions, favorable or other, in short, pithy style.

**LONG-RANGE DEFENCE!**—Alberta Social Crediters have always fought shy of making direct defence of their position against attacks by The Rebel. In fact, up to now, about the only "come-back" at us came some months ago in a letter from AUSTRALIA published in the Hon. Lucien Maynard's "Today and Tomorrow," in which we were attacked in the customary Social Credit manner—by innuendo. However, Social Crediters are becoming bolder, and defenders of the something-for-nothing cult are now within about 2000 miles, as witness a three-quarter column editorial in the "social credit" Ottawa Citizen under date of December 9, in which we are taken to task, albeit rather mildly, for some things we said in our December issue. When Social Crediters within the province can pick up enough courage to face us openly, our respect for them will rise appreciably.

**HAVE YOU READ IT?**—Have you read Barney Halpin's book of rollicking rhymes on "Pulpit Pounding Bill"? If not, send two bits to him at Black Diamond for a copy. You'll get your money's worth.

**FINGERS UNCROSSED!**—The morning after our broadcast of Dec. 19, a prominent Douglas Social Creditor told us that he had always

wondered whether we were in the pay of the "financial interests, but that after hearing that radio talk he was convinced that we were not. Another outstanding Calgary Social Creditor, one who took a leading part in Mr. Aberhart's campaign, phoned to say that heretofore he had always had his "fingers crossed" about us. "But after hearing you last night," he said, "I uncrossed them." We are glad to have this recognition from Social Crediters, and many people would be surprised to know how many letters, phone calls, etc., we have received expressing similar sentiments. And why should not TRUE Social Crediters feel friendly toward us? Have we been their friend or enemy? We shall let THEM answer.

**NO SNEAKING OUT!**—In an address at a meeting of women's auxiliaries of Calgary Social Credit groups on Dec. 12, Premier Aberhart intimated that he may retire from the leadership of his party within a year. We have drawn attention before to the indications Mr. Aberhart has given of his evident desire to "get out from under" the mess which he has created, and no doubt, as he perceives the inevitable crash of his foundationless structure relentlessly approaching nearer and nearer, we shall hear from him more and more alibis for retiring before he is buried in the debris of disgrace and dishonor which must be his when the collapse comes. It must not be forgotten that on one other occasion when collapse seemed imminent, he HIMSELF was responsible for circulating a petition DEMANDING HIS OWN RESIGNATION. Aberhart must not be allowed to sneak out of the picture. He must be made to face the music, to shoulder the responsibility for the terrible condition of strife and discord which he has created by his gospel of greed and bigotry. He must be forced into a position where he will be compelled to acknowledge his public crimes, and thus, by the exposure of his fraud and deception, himself be made to open the eyes of those whom he deluded so cruelly. Until the eyes and minds and consciences of his dupes recognize the true ugliness of the blasphemous fraud which he has perpetrated UPON THEM, they will remain as a constant threat to the moral and political stability of the province. Aberhart must go, indeed, but he must not be allowed to sneak out so that he may put the blame for his failure upon others and he pose as a martyr. He must be held accountable for his public misdeeds and be KICKED OUT in disgrace and dishonor.

**A FRIEND!**—So far as we are aware, The Bonnyville Nouvelle, that fighting weekly of the North, is the only Alberta newspaper to have extended a word of welcome to the new series of The Rebel. It was against The Nouvelle that the Social Crediters of that area instituted a vigorous boycott and such a vile campaign of abuse that its editor, John W. Johnston, suffered a breakdown of health so serious that for a while all hope for his life was given up. As a former editor of one of the leading weeklies, as a former director of a provincial body of the Weekly Newspapers' Association, as one who has paid the highest tribute to the weekly press of Alberta for its splendid fight for freedom of speech, and as one who has himself fought no less tenaciously for this sacred right, we would expect the press to side either for or against us in respect of the issues which we have raised. However, as we believe in COMPLETE freedom of the press, we must, and do, of course, grant our fellow-editors the right to exercise their privilege of ignoring us. After all, freedom of speech implies not only the liberty to speak, but also to remain silent.

**REAL CO-OPERATION.**—Eleven subscriptions were sent in in one day by a Rebel booster of Didsbury the other day. If every friend did only half as well, The Rebel would soon cover the province like a blanket. As distribution through newsdealers is seriously hampered because of intimidation and threats of boycott, may we count on YOUR co-operation in giving The Rebel the widest possible circulation?

**NAZI PROPAGANDA.**—In its issue of Nov. 25, the "Deutsche Zeitung fuer Canada," a German newspaper published in Winnipeg, has this to say in a front-page editorial captioned "Pharisees" in regard to the recent protest meetings throughout the U.S.A. and Canada in connection with the Nazi persecution of Jews: "Be they Aryan or non-Aryan, we must make categorical denial of the right of Americans and Canadians to protest." It is such unmitigated, insulting gall of certain brainless Germans in Canada which brings abuse not only upon good Canadian citizens of German birth or extraction as a whole but stirs up the poison of racial prejudice in general. Nazi propaganda is said to be carried on with especial fervor in Alberta, which is not at all surprising, in view of the fact that the spirit of dictatorship is officially in governmental power here and is supinely tolerated even by those who, with their lips, profess to be so violently opposed to it.

## YOU SHOULD HAVE IT!

In order to be able to appreciate the full significance of the Aberhart-Low letters in this issue, you should have a copy of the DECEMBER issue which caused all the rumpus. 10 cents will bring you a copy by mail. Or send \$1 for a year's subscription, and the December issue will be sent to you FREE. There will be action, plenty of it, at the February session of the legislature, and we want you to know what it's all about when the "fireworks" start. Therefore, subscribe NOW.



## TO SOCIAL CREDIT M.L.A.'s

### Your Clear Duty is To Force Premier Aberhart to "Face the Music"

"To degrade and insult a man as the worst of criminals, and afterwards to trust him in your highest concerns as a faithful, honest and zealous servant, is NOT CONSISTENT WITH REASONING, nor PRUDENT IN POLICY, nor SAFE IN PRACTICE."

That is what Edmund Burke said of the revolutionaries who formed the French Assembly after the French revolution, who, after they had revolted against their king, degraded and insulted him in every conceivable manner, never the less pretended to honor him, for the sole purpose, as history reveals, of "using" him to serve their selfish designs, while at heart they despised him. They were inspired by the Social Credit precept, "Results Not Methods."

That is what we say to you today—to those of you, at least, who, after your insurgency last year, in the course of which you publicly denounced Aberhart as a liar, double-crosser, and coward and in general held him up publicly as just about the lowest scoundrel imaginable, you never the less returned to him and professed to "trust him in your highest concerns as a faithful, honest and zealous servant." Not only that, but, by signing the infamous "Secret Pledge," in which you acknowledged loyalty to the Social Credit board as your FIRST obligation and agreed to refrain from "recriminations"—in other words, to keep your mouths shut, you violated your oath of office requiring you to speak openly, without fear or favor or respect of persons, and submitted to the humiliating degradation of padlocking your mouths, denying your reason and violating your conscience.

Your supine surrender was without doubt one of the most disgusting, disgraceful spectacles of public hypocrisy since the French revolution. Certainly it is not uncharitable to describe your conduct as "not consistent with reasoning, nor prudent in policy, nor safe in practice."

You know that while at the time of your insurgency many people were prepared to credit you with at least sincerity of purpose, your abject surrender of convictions and spineless compromise with the very man whom you had openly denounced as the worst of scoundrels, could bring forth only the pitying contempt of all decent people. You did not even ATTEMPT to justify your cowardly conduct,—obviously because in your hearts you knew then, and know today, that by no reasoning or logic could your glaring inconsistency be justified.

"Nor prudent in policy."—Undoubtedly you compromised with Aberhart—and he with you—because all of you, hungry for the spoils of office, and, worse still, your consciences dulled by the fiendish fiction, "Results Not Methods," deceived yourselves into thinking that it was good policy to do so. "Results not methods"—the end justifies the means! Thus you reasoned, while your common sense should have warned you against making such a compromise of conscience. Now, perhaps, you appreciate that any policy devoid of honor and justice is no policy at all; or, if it is, worse than none at all. Was your confidence in Aberhart and his in you enhanced or further impaired by the compromise? You know that you merely succeeded in emphasizing your mutual contempt and self-degradation. It was a thieves' bargain. In your hearts you despise Aberhart and he you, and the public despises the lot of you, more than ever before.

"Nor safe in practice."—How, indeed, could there be safe and sane administration by a government composed of men who not only double-cross one another but themselves, to say nothing of deceiving the public? A government without honor, without justice—a government without a policy! It could not be otherwise than that your record should be one of a series of "starts, stops and reversals."

And why do we thus "rub it in"? To hurt your feelings? No! We have no desire to make fools of you and to hold you up to public ridicule and contempt. YOUR OWN ridiculous and contemptible public conduct has done that far more effectively than we could do it.

Our purpose is to instruct you in your public duty, and in doing so, we are paying you the compliment of assuming that there are among you still some with enough intelligence to recognize their duty when it is clearly pointed out and with enough decency and courage to discharge it. Your clear duty is:

1. To acknowledge frankly that your government has NO MANDATE for its present practices, and that, by its repudiation of obligations and its illegal legislation and, in fact, by its every major legislative act, it has gone directly opposite to the original mandate of the people.

2. To acknowledge frankly that your compromise with Aberhart was an act of cowardice; and to publicly confess your disgrace and failure.

3. To DEMAND public investigation of the charges of dishonesty, etc., which YOU, yourselves, made PUBLICLY against Aberhart, as well as those which have been made by others, including The Rebel, to the end that, if the charges be found well-based, Aberhart be compelled to retire from office in merited disgrace and dishonor; and, if found untrue, those who have made these serious charges be punished.

4. To, if Aberhart refuses to grant a public investigation, demand his immediate resignation, and you, yourselves, resign immediately.

A "tough assignment"? Yes! But nothing less will satisfy the demands of justice under the circumstances which your own misconduct has precipitated; and only in demonstrating that you have the decency and courage to face the consequences of your own folly is there any hope of saving yourselves from a worse fate; only in this way can you hope to amend in some small measure for the great wrong you have done to the people of Alberta.

Have you the courage to discharge the duty before you?

### How True, Bro. Aberhart!

During the past few weeks our quoting Premier has made much of a certain bit of verse, on various occasions repeating it two and three times, very slowly and emphatically, to make it "sink in." From hearing them so often, we know the lines by heart. Here they are:

"There is a destiny which makes us brothers,—  
None of us can walk alone;  
All that we send into the lives of others  
Comes back into our own."

The first two lines are rather platitudinous, but there is much truth in the last two. Yes, Bro. Aberhart, "All that we send into the lives of others comes back into our own." For instance, all the vile lies and slanders, your hysterical denunciations of your opponents as "liars, Sons of Satan, rats, fornicators, howling wolves, barking dogs, diabolical enemies," etc., which you hurled from your political pulpit, are coming home to roost. Your seeds of hatred, discord, bigotry, intolerance and blasphemy have taken root, have grown to maturity, and you are now reaping the harvest of contempt and dishonor which they have brought forth. Long will you be compelled to eat of the fruit thereof in public shame and private misery. We are very sorry for you. But, "As a man soweth so shall he also reap."

## DO YOUR PART TO BEAT THE BOYCOTT!

Although willing to handle The Rebel, wholesale newsdealers, threatened and intimidated, are AFRAID TO DO SO. Consequently, because we have not yet been able to make complete arrangements to make direct distribution to retail newsdealers, it is still difficult to get The Rebel from them.

However, the boycott can be licked, if YOU will do your part by letting your friends know where the trouble lies, and by encouraging them to SUBSCRIBE BY MAIL. With YOUR co-operation, no threats, intimidations or boycott can stop us from getting the facts to the people. May we count on you?

## Just What Did Aberhart Promise?

PROPOSITION: They who say that they did not vote for Aberhart because of the \$25 lure but because they regarded him as an honest "Christian gentleman," are either fools or liars. If they did not believe his assurance that he could pay them \$25 per month out of thin air, they must have regarded HIM as a liar and NOT as an honest man, and were therefore fools to vote for his hooey; while, if it is true that, as they claim, they regarded him as an honest man, they MUST have BELIEVED him, and, as apart from his bait of \$25 per month from the blue sky, Aberhart had absolutely NOTHING to offer, they could not possibly have had ANY OTHER reason for supporting him. THEREFORE: If these people are HONEST, the sooner they will frankly acknowledge that they were fools to support Aberhart and join boldly in the efforts to remove him from office, the sooner will it become possible to come to grips with the real problems confronting us all.

Just what did Mr. Aberhart promise the citizens of Alberta in 1935? In his home town of Seaford, Ont., on Dec. 4, he denied ever having promised \$25 per month.

On Dec. 18 he stated in Edmonton: "At NO TIME have I ever stated any fixed amount that should be paid at the beginning."

It seems rather silly that after three years in office, Mr. Aberhart should pretend not to know just exactly why or how he got there; for if there is one thing beyond question, it is that he won office because of the people's belief that he had a perfect plan whereby he could pay free, costless dividends of \$25 to \$75 per month to every adult citizen and lesser amounts to minors, as well as provide interest-free production loans—all in a legal manner.

But, after all, did he really PROMISE \$25 a month? Just as in regard to virtually every one of his important public utterances, the answer can be both yes and no; for it is doubtful that there is any principal phase of his crooked scheme in regard to which he is not on record as holding at least two contradictory positions. On few, if any, important matters can he be said to have taken a straight, unequivocal stand which he has not also at some point opposed. For crude yet, in a sense, tricky, mugwumpery, he stands in a class all by himself.

Let us see what he has to say in his famous Social Credit Manual in regard to dividends.

Page 14: "The cultural heritage is made operative by the regular issuance of dividends from month to month sufficient to secure for the individual citizen the bare necessities of food, clothing and shelter . . . To enable each citizen to secure these bare necessities, each of them will receive a pass-book in which at the beginning of each month will be entered the basic dividend for the month, say \$25.00." Observe the "say;" not a "promise!"

Page 19: "Basic dividends should be \$25 a month for every bona fide citizen, male or female, twenty-one years or more. Children of bona fide citizens sixteen years old will receive \$5 a month. Those seventeen and eighteen years old will receive \$10 a month. Those nineteen, \$15, and those twenty, \$20 a month." But here follows in parenthesis: "These figures are merely suggested for illustration purposes." So, you see, he can say it was not a "promise."

Page 47: "Will dividends always remain at \$25 a month?" Answer: "No. We believe that the dividends will increase as the standard of living increases. We are not in favor of increasing the dividends, however, very rapidly at first . . . We feel certain that the amount of dividends per month will, however, be soon increased above \$25." Not a "promise." Dear, No! But what a hope, more potent than a thousand promises! He may not have said: "I PROMISE you \$25 a month." But he said he could DO it! He "believed," he "felt CERTAIN" the amount would be "soon INCREASED above \$25." If such language does not constitute a promise, and MORE than a promise, just what DOES it mean!

The night before the election which swept his party into power, Mr. Aberhart said: "I have been doing a little figuring and I FIND that \$25 a month can be paid JUST AS EASY as \$25." Does that sound anything like a promise? Time and again during his campaign he stated definitely that dividends could be paid as easily as "falling off a log." There was absolutely nothing to it. Credit was a mere book entry which came out of the end of a fountain pen and cost absolutely nothing. He "proved" his "theory" to his fanatical followers by his famous story about Pat and Mike consuming the barrel of beer with only a dime as the medium of exchange and by his equally famous "blood-stream" bunkum, according to which ten million dollars in FREE dividends in the form of non-negotiable certificates would go merrily round and round, providing in the process \$120,000,000 worth of boots and shirts and socks and butter and flour and everything else the heart could desire. He "proved" it with such good effect that we poor, ignorant skeptics were howled down whenever we dared to cast even the slightest doubt upon the crazy idea.

So Mr. Aberhart never "promised" the \$25! We have some reason to suspect, however, that he at least heard rumors about this \$25 idea before the '35 election. That something of the sort appears to have been left in the minds of THE PEOPLE somehow, would seem to be indicated by the fact that after eighteen months in office the government itself OFFICIALLY CONFIRMED the promise by officially designating the amount as—a "promise"?—no, but as the DEMAND of the people! The first paragraph of the "Agreement of Association," more commonly known as the "Secret Pledge," approved and signed by every cabinet minister and every loyal Social Credit M.L.A., reads: "The people of Alberta have demanded a secure sufficiency of the amenities of life in freedom and that it shall be in the form of \$25-A MONTH for all bona fide citizens of Alberta and be accompanied by a lower cost to live." Who dares say this is a promise? It is no such thing. It is a DEMAND by the people! After eighteen months in office, the government discovers that for some strange, unknown reason, the dear people are DEMANDING of the government to perform the miracle of paying each and every one of them \$25 a month! No one had PROMISED them any \$25! Certainly the saintly, honorable Mr. Aberhart had not planted this silly notion into their minds. Has he not SAID that he never made any such promise? Quiet, quiet, you "heelers" of the diabolical financial octopus! Unquote.

What an infernally rotten mess! If we did not have this spectacle of filthy fraud before our very eyes, we would not believe it possible. His definite ASSURANCE that he can DO a thing is not a PROMISE! No, of course not. Just as he used to say that a "levy" is not a tax.

Oh, well, so long as Albertans are collectively so brainless and spineless as to put up with this sort of thing, it is really better than they deserve.

# The Fascist Mind at Work

SHOULD EVERY PERSON HAVE A RIGHT TO HIS OWN OPINIONS?—WE READ "MAC" OF THE "SEARCHLIGHT" A LESSON IN ELEMENTARY LOGIC

Nothing could indicate more clearly the Fascist or Nazi nature of the Social Credit philosophy and the denial of the basic principles of democracy by Alberta Social Crediters than the effusion by Gilbert McGregor, the "Mac" of the daily "Searchlight" articles in the Albertan, under date of Dec. 10. With his characteristically rotten grammar, he starts the article with this bit of equally rotten logic:

"If one wishes to realize the utter folly of every man having a right to his own opinion, they have but to read the newspapers any day of the week and there they will see for themselves just what this stupid idea will bring them to."

If Mac regards the right to individual opinion as UTTER FOLLY and a STUPID IDEA, by what manner of reasoning does he justify HIS OWN daily exercise of that same right? What could be more foolish and stupid than his exercise of a privilege which he himself denounces as foolish and stupid? By his own logic, by his own words, he condemns HIMSELF as a stupid fool! Quite apparently, Mac would deny the right of free speech to others, while retaining it for himself so that he could force HIS ideas across without opposition. That is the spirit of Fascism. It is also an admission of his unwillingness and incapacity to face opposition on a basis of equality.

Mac continues: "One man says what we require is a new government. Another says we should copy the Scandinavian countries. Still another will tell us that we should have credit unions. Is democracy a mere jumble of contrary voices? A betlam? It would seem so in the face of the foregoing. And it is a pity that those with opinions should have so much as passing attention paid to them."

It is almost impossible of belief that any person in his right mind could give voice to such unadulterated idiocy. ALL progress that has ever been made, was made precisely BECAUSE of "contrary voices" and BECAUSE "those with opinions" had attention paid to them. All history teaches that it was only when, as Mac would do now, "contrary voices" and conflicting opinions were suppressed, that progress was stifled and decay set in to destroy those nations which denied, as Mac would, every man the right to his own opinion. By his own logic, in his own words, Mac's own opinions, which he spouts off so freely, should not "have as much as passing interest paid to them." We pay them attention here, not that we would deny him the right to his opinions, but because we are sure his opinions are vicious and poisonous.

Mac again: "The plain truth is that those who speak of confidence are at the moment seeking to destroy the very thing they claim to be building."

If he means the Aberhart government, we certainly would agree that by its crazy antics in the field of illegal legislation and official contempt for constituted law and order it is certainly destroying public confidence in the fundamentals of good government.

Further: "Everything concerned with public interest is being set aside in order that politics may be successfully played." In other paragraphs he makes further comment to emphasize his contempt for "politics" and politicians.

In this observation Mac expresses the widely prevalent idiotic notion that there should be no politics in government. As politics is the art of government, or government the application of politics, it should be obvious to even the densest that government without politics is IMPOSSIBLE. When these nit-wits claim that they "have no politics," they are lying, for their very claim that they have no politics IS THEIR POLITICS; just as those fools who say they have no religious creed—THAT is their creed. This "no politics" fraud is, of course, perpetrated chiefly by the very lowest type of politician. Aberhart preached this vile deception to such effect that it was largely responsible for sweeping his party into office. According to him, Social Credit was not politics, but "applied Christianity," the "Economy of God," and what-not, when as a matter of fact he was but pulling the dirtiest political swindle in Canadian history.

Here is Mac's conclusion, and in it we can recognize the real twist in his obviously aberrated brain: "What we have a right to," says this wonder man of the Searchlight, "is to know the TRUTH. Our affairs should be handled by men who know what they are doing. In one direction lies death—in another, salvation."

So Mac would know the truth! Admirable! Yet, in the same article in which he professes this wholly laudable desire for the truth, he denounces as UTTER FOLLY and STUPID the right to free opinion—the ONLY WAY in which TRUTH can be discovered! It is an elementary principle confirmed by the nature of truth itself that it is only as ideas are subjected to the clash and conflict of opposing and



varying opinions that the truth has any chance of emerging at all. No person has ever learned a truth, in the sense of being able to KNOW the truth as such, in ANY OTHER WAY. There simply is no other way of learning the truth. An idea received by any person without its having been compared with or opposed by other ideas, cannot possibly, even though it be the purest truth, be to such a person anything but a mere opinion; and until he HAS subjected it to comparison with other ideas, it may, for AUGHT HE KNOWS, be, not a truth, but a falsehood. How can Mac, or anyone else, know that his opinion of what to him constitutes the "truth" in respect of ANY matter is actually the truth unless he has given consideration to OPPOSING opinions? If he would deny OTHERS the right of freely expressing THEIR opinions, how would he KNOW, without hearing THEIR opinions that HIS OWN were not WRONG and their's RIGHT? Might he not be cherishing a FALSEHOOD as a truth and SUPPRESSING a truth as a falsehood,—thus making truth into a LIE and exalting a lie to the position of truth?

By his stand, Mac virtually claims DIVINE INFALLIBILITY, and we deal with the matter here at such length because his crazy concept is wide-spread in the province and is without doubt one of the worst mind- and soul-destroying POISONS being propagated by Alberta Social Crediters today. In fact, it is of the very essence of their so-called philosophy. Aberhart himself is, of course the worst offender. By his representation of Social Credit as the "Economy of God," he has set the chief example for blasphemously claiming divine infallibility, and it is only logical that his fanatical followers should be equally presumptuous and in their misguided zeal should deny the evidence of their own senses, the authority of reason and even the nature of truth itself.

The simple truth is that they have no "case." If they had, they would be only too happy to present it openly and defend it against all opposition. The ONLY justification ANYONE can have for entertaining a proposition is a willingness, nay, an anxiety, to have it subjected to any and every attack and PROVED WRONG if possible; for if one is genuinely desirous of getting the truth, he will be grateful to whosoever will prove him to have been in error. But Aberhart and his gang of shysters, having no case and being therefore incapable of defending their falsities, refuse all debate and discussion and would, if they could, suppress all opposition—the very things they should, and would, encourage if they were honest. Thus, by their own attitude toward the ONLY METHOD BY WHICH TRUTH CAN BE OBTAINED, they PROVE that their aim is to SUPPRESS THE TRUTH and to propagate falsehood. It is the perverted Fascist mentality in action.

J. B. CARMICHAEL, of Kinuso, in a personal letter says that we are paid by the "political and financial interests" for making our broadcasts and publishing the Rebel, that we have not the "courage to stand up and be a man," that we are a "pimp," a "low-down miserable skunk" and sound "suspiciously like a Communist." Naturally, being quite obviously under the spell of the brand of "Christian" love and charity and fairness regularly preached by Aberhart from his Pathetic Bible Substitute, it did not occur to Mr. Carmichael to support his accusations with any PROOF whatsoever. The fact that we are making our broadcasts openly and publishing our convictions just as openly in The Rebel, would not appeal to the brave Mr. Carmichael as "courage to stand up and be a man." No; apparently HIS conception of courage and manhood is to utter slander and lies—not PUBLICLY so that he may be taken into court to answer for his charges—but in personal letters, where no action can be taken. Well, brave Mr. Carmichael, we have brought you into the open, and we say that your allegations are LIES and that you are a YELLOW COWARD. Now, Mr. "Hero" Carmichael, here is your chance to prove how much courage and manhood YOU have. Have you the backbone to "stand up and be a man" by making your allegations in PUBLIC? If so, why don't you do it? We have had a standing challenge for three years or more to meet ANY defender of Aberhart, including Aberhart himself, in public debate, at any mutually convenient time and place, but so far NOT ONE has had the courage to accept the challenge. Have you? If so, you are just the "bird" we have been looking for these many moons. Now PUT UP OR SHUT UP. Incidentally, if, as the "intelligent" Mr. Carmichael suggests, we were a Communist, we would be SUPPORTING Aberhart, as the Communists are doing, quite openly. Time and again Communists have spoken from Social Credit platforms in support of the Aberhart government, even having been introduced by Social Credit leaders as "COMRADES." So, please, don't be so silly!

CHEAP! CHEAP!—The Hon. (?) D. B. Mullen, at a Social Credit meeting in Edmonton on Dec. 6: "If Mr. Bennett died in this country, we would collect fifteen million dollars from his estate; but he's going over to the Old Country to save ten percent." What a nice, charitable thing for a cabinet minister of a government to say about a man like the Rt. Hon. R. B. Bennett, a man who has devoted so many years of his life to unselfish service of his country! But, as these Aberhartists are in office precisely because they have neither any sense of public decency nor self-respect, it is only logical that they should be disrespectful toward their moral and intellectual superiors.

## SUBSCRIBE DIRECT

by

# MAIL!

because--

1. It will SAVE YOU MONEY and time, and ensures prompt delivery of every issue.

2. It brings to us the money which would otherwise go to newsdealers in commissions, and thus enables us to finance the publication to greater effect.

Regular subscription, in Canada, \$1 for 12 issues, postpaid. Outside of Canada, \$1.25. Let us send The Rebel to your friends in the East, England, the U.S.A., or elsewhere.



## "SUSTAINING"

## SUBSCRIPTIONS INVITED

Because The Rebel does not carry advertising, the regular subscription price is inadequate to meet all costs. "Sustaining" subscriptions are for those who are ABLE and who DESIRE to contribute toward defraying expenses of publication and to finance expansion work, such as radio broadcasts, newspaper advertising, etc.

Sustaining subscriptions may be in any amount over the regular subscription price. For every dollar in excess of the regular subscription price, the subscriber may either have The Rebel sent to as many persons of his choice or he may designate any part or all of the amount for expansion purposes.

### What YOU Can Do:

You can help to double, treble, quadruple, or more, the subscription list of The Rebel by encouraging YOUR friends to subscribe by MAIL.

You can subscribe for your friends, in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada, the U.S.A., England and other countries.

### NEWS BOYS WANTED

We have a real proposition for honest hustlers to make money selling The Rebel or taking subscriptions in their communities. Write for particulars.



### MAIL YOUR SUBSCRIPTION

"Regular" or "Sustaining"—NOW, 

# THE REBEL

426 - 15th Street N.W.

Calgary, Alberta

## WHY DOES LOW URGE PREMIER?—Continued from Page 1.

You will not forget the Brownlee case I am sure.—(Here Mr. Low makes certain comment on the Brownlee case which we dare not publish.)

Please note that Mr. Low professes to give Mr. ABERHART'S reasons for not taking action. Observe the fear that the NEWSPAPERS would put the WRONG CONSTRUCTION upon COURT EVIDENCE. If only the press could be muzzled, eh what! As for the silly suggestion that we would risk a penitentiary term just to get the "satisfaction" of having our "contemptible" statements held up to review, etc., well, we may be crazy, but not THAT crazy. Mr. Low's letter continues:

"2. It is never possible to clarify an issue of this kind before the courts, for it is the right of the accused or his lawyer to introduce almost endless EXTRANEIOUS MATTER in an effort to INFLUENCE THE TRIBUNAL against the complainant. It is easy to make a statement that will be PLAYED UP BY THE PAPERS, but it is most difficult to bring EVIDENCE TO DISPROVE that statement without doing more harm than the original assertion has made."

This paragraph is a clear admission that there IS an "issue" to be clarified. A more damaging admission, however, is that he does not TRUST THE COURTS, because, he says, "extraneous matter" might influence the tribunal AGAINST the complainant. So! But, if Mr. Aberhart is so pure and innocent, what "extraneous matter" could he possibly fear? After all, WE are supposed to be the CRIMINAL and should therefore have more to fear in respect of "extraneous matter" than he, in ADDITION to the CRIME of which we are supposed to be guilty. Has he really SO LITTLE FAITH in the COURTS and his OWN CASE that he fears the courts would FAVOR US! What contempt of the courts by the CHIEF LAW OFFICER of the province! The letter reads further:

"Any action brought would be construed as a low political attack by the Premier, so that he would be generally misunderstood, especially since very few people would have all the facts before them on both sides. They would say he was trying to get even for the Unwin and Powell affair."

Poor fellow! Afraid of being "misunderstood"! What an excuse for not doing his duty! But apparently Mr. Low DOES NOT CONSIDER THESE REASONS WORTH A TOOT, for he says next:

"However, if I were in the PREMIER'S place today, I would STOP ZUBICK from publishing another issue of that paper if it was MY LAST MORTAL ACT, and I am ADVISING the premier to DO JUST THAT. It is ridiculous that the principle of freedom of speech should be subjected to such unbridled license and is just one more reason why some form of restraint should be exercised against those whose MORALITY is SO DEPRAVED that they will risk anything to drag the names of public officials down into the mud of public scandal."

"I appreciate your interest in this matter and assure you that I SHALL DO ALL IN MY POWER to see that JUSTICE is done."

Truly yours,

(Signed) "S. E. LOW,

Provincial Treasurer."

Regular fire-eater, this Low fellow, what! What HE wouldn't do if HE were PREMIER! Perhaps he would LIKE to be PREMIER! Is it possible! Is his REAL reason for urging the Premier so strongly to take action against us that he would have Aberhart go into court where he would eliminate himself as Premier and thus, perhaps, leave the way to the Premiership open to Mr. Low? If Mr. Low knows anything at all, he knows that our every accusation against Mr. Aberhart is TRUE, and that the Premier could therefore not dare go into court; that if he did, it would certainly finish him as Premier. However, if Mr. Low is truly sincere in his declared desire to see that "justice is done," we are all for him, for that is exactly what WE DEMAND. So, Low, for Premier! Rah! Rah! Rah! Just think of what we've been missing! For three years we've had a Premier who will not fight, who is afraid of the courts, afraid of the newspapers, afraid of "extraneous matters," afraid, the poor thing, of being "misunderstood," and all the time we have had this brave man, Low, without as much as a good fight on his hands! Just the man we've been looking for! Courts, newspapers, "extraneous matters," Poof! Such things have no terror for the fighting Mr. Low. He's not even afraid of such "morally depraved" rascals as the editor of The Rebel. No Sirree! Mister Low would wade right into him and "stop" him, just like that—"if it was my last mortal act!"

We're right behind you, Sol old sock, old boy, 111 percent! Do your stuff! Get Aberhart OUT and yourself IN, and let's go places! Then we would at least have a fighting Premier instead of a whining weakling who is afraid to say Boo! And, we assure you, a SURE-FIRE way of getting Aberhart OUT is to have him TAKE YOUR ADVICE to start action against us. It's YOUR OWN IDEA, isn't it, this advice? It is most excellent advice. Remember, Low, Old Bean, we shall depend upon you to keep your word to "DO ALL IN MY POWER to see that JUSTICE IS DONE." These are YOUR BRAVE WORDS. Are they just so much hot air, or do you mean business? If you mean business, DO YOUR STUFF! But, we must not forget Mr. Aberhart's letter. Here is his reply to a letter from a Calgary citizen inquiring as to why the Premier did not take action against us. Note that it is dated two days later than Mr. Low's letter, two days AFTER Mr. Low said he was advising the Premier to take action:

## PREMIER ABERHART'S LETTER

Edmonton, December 16, 1938.

"Dear Sir: I have your letter of the 5th instant and note your statements regarding the publication referred to."

"I do not see what the PURPOSE could be in PUTTING IN JAIL such a man as this editor appears to be. The STATE WOULD HAVE TO KEEP HIM and likely look after his wife and children."

"I do not think your suggestion that I resign because someone makes a lot of FOOLISH DECLARATIONS, which are ENTIRELY FALSE, is founded on very good reasoning."

"I think any discussion of the matter is a WASTE OF TIME but did not want to appear discourteous in not replying to your letter. I hope you appreciate my view in the matter."

Yours truly,

(Signed) "William Aberhart,

PREMIER."

So our Premier does "not see" what the "purpose" could be in "putting in jail such a man as this editor appears to be." Thanks for the compliment! Neither do we. Certainly we do not want to go to jail. When serving, as a Justice of the Peace, we sent many people to jail, and the idea of going there ourselves does not appeal to us at all! But, how glibly he speaks of "putting in jail"! The thought of first giving us a FAIR TRIAL and that such a trial would not necessarily mean "putting in jail" for US, apparently has not entered our dear Premier's bright mind.

"The State would have to keep him..." What a quaint sense of JUSTICE! As though THAT were a good reason for not sending a person to jail if he had committed a crime meriting imprisonment! What an ALIBI FOR NOT DOING HIS DUTY! Here is our Attorney General, UNDER OATH to enforce the law, and he would make a very special exception in our case and decline to send us to jail because the State would have to keep us! His REAL reason is quite obvious. Aberhart KNOWS that our every charge is TRUE, and that if JUSTICE were done, it is more likely that HE rather than we would GO TO JAIL.

Foolish declarations, which are ENTIRELY FALSE. Of course, it would not occur to him to be so good as to PROVE EVEN ONE declaration to be false! HIS declaration, in spite of the PUBLIC EVIDENCE against him, is supposed to be sufficient PROOF of HIS innocence!

What about it, Albertans! Are you going to continue to put up with Aberhart's silly excuses for failing to do his duty, or are you, with the Hon. Solon Low, going to do all in your power to see that JUSTICE is done! Here is your opportunity to bring this crazy Alberta political situation to a head. We have done OUR part. We have provided you with the LEVER by which you can FORCE ABERHART OUT of his dishonorably-acquired position and bring to an end this tragedy of strife and discord; restore public confidence, introduce honesty and decency into public affairs, and make it possible to really come to grips with the serious problems before us. It is up to YOU!

## TO PREMIER ABERHART

By the way, Mr. Premier, do you think it possible that Mr. Low is so stupid that he would write a letter in which he PUTS YOU ON THE SPOT, as he does in his letter above, without taking due precautions that such a letter would not fall into OUR hands? Bear in mind, please, his letter was not a PERSONAL letter, but OFFICIAL, signed in his official capacity of Provincial Treasurer. Bear in mind, too, that it was not written to a Social Creditor, but to a FRIEND OF THE REBEL. Our feeling is that Mr. Low would not be so stupid as to write such a letter unless he INTENDED it to come into our possession FOR PUBLICATION. What do YOU think?

## THE HYPOCRITE

By Lew Wrigglesworth

(For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased.—Luke 14:11.)

Behold him smugly standing there—

Yon inconsistent Pharisee;

Such saintly mien and pious air—

A loathsome public enemy!

No dastard deed, no act so vile

Could shock such one, immune to shame;

Acclaiming virtue, yet, the while

Defaming God's all-hallowed name.

And who are we to countenance

This freak dressed up in human skin—

So blind and deaf to righteous sense

He'd weep anent a neighbor's sin!

Vain, false, pretender, soul of hate;

Cheap Hitler-mimic thou you be—

A Mussolini-reprobate—

Usurping high authority.

Soon shall you end, your hand be stayed;

See, yonder writing 'gainst the wall:

"Found wanting"—you've been judged and weighed—

Thus self-created looms your fall!